

MR 60-4137/A

8 JUN 1960

Mr. George Teet  
VALLEY TIMES  
11109 Magnolia Blvd.  
North Hollywood, Calif.

Dear Mr. Teet:

Thank you for sending me your column of  
28 May 1960 regarding my brother John Foster Dulles.  
I appreciate what you wrote, and I plan to show your  
column to his widow.

From time to time I receive the various columns  
you send to me, and I do appreciate your thoughtfulness.

Thank you for your interest.

Sincerely,

SIGNED

Allen W. Dulles  
Director

ODCI/SJGrogan/nhh (2 June 1960)

Distribution:

Orig - Add

1 - ER w/basic

✓ 1 - ODCI via reading

2 - SJGrogan

STAT
June
Kitty
Chad
DCI file
ER

# VALLEY TIMES

11109 Magnolia Blvd., North Hollywood, Calif.  
POplar 3-5141 :: TRIangle 7-3471

May 28, 1960

60-4137

Mr. Allen Dulles, Director  
Central Intelligence Agency  
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Dulles:

Enclosed is a recent column of mine which is a  
tribute to your deceased brother, John Foster Dulles.  
I think he was a great American, but you will be able  
to tell that upon reading the column.

It is my personal belief that the tougher we get with  
the Reds, the more tractable the latter will become.  
They are only amenable to force, or the threat of force.  
Which is typical of those who suffer from a bully complex.

With continuing regards,

I remain,

Sincerely,

*George Fodt*  
George Fodt  
Editorial Columnist

GT:h

SATURDAY, MAY 21, 1960

## TODT'S OPINION

# Profit Seen In Summit Debacle

By  
George  
Todt

"Why make a treaty with a liar who will break his word before night-fall?"—GENGHIS KHAN

The spewing forth by the Soviet Union at the now-flattened summit, in the person of Nikita S. Khrushchev, its number one tyrant for the moment, may demonstrate that there is a silver lining to every cloud. This should be no exception. Here is why:



Todt

The Bolshevik leaders in the Kremlin, plus their Red Chinese stooges in Peiping, are now revealed to be not very far removed from wily neurotics with a schizophrenic bent — if indeed there is any real difference. Many of us have known this right along. But there also have been far-too-numerous wishful thinkers in the Western camp who blindly hoped otherwise.

Particularly to the clique devoted to world government, centered largely in the World Federalist movement and related radical liberal organizations. To these starry-eyed dreamers, Khrushchev and Mao Tse-tung could do no wrong. They were willing to make any accommodation with the enemy, even to the extent of giving up our qualitative nuclear arms and national sovereignty. This kind of lunacy ought to be apparent now for what it really is to all who take the trouble to open their

eyes wide to tough-minded realism.

The year 1960 is no time for the lion to lie down with the lamb—or the wolves with the goats! If we have learned that much as a result of Mr. K's verbal bombardment of the West in Paris, it will still be worthwhile to us. But there is more to be absorbed in this intriguing lesson.

The breakdown of the summit was no great loss—in fact many Americans had long been counseling against it. After the idiotic results produced by the first summit meeting in Geneva several years ago, I thought it was absurd for us to be led like a lamb to another slaughter.

Quite sadly, events have proven us right. I write the word "sadly" because this is one time when we might prefer to have been mistaken. For it was a real tragedy to see the vituperative Khrushchev cause President Eisenhower to go all the way to Paris—almost a prop, as it were, for his hammy histrionics—just to be unloaded upon.

Here was Eisenhower, a soldier who has devoted his whole term in the Presidency to world peace, suddenly turned into the butt for Mr. K's ribald and scurrilous buffoonery.

Fortunately for us, Ike was so mad about the lunatic insults hurled at him by the Red boss, that he almost blew his top. And this may be the most hopeful sign of all for us. Because whenever the President gets angry enough to do a little sabre-rattling on his own account—I am convinced that the Communists will retreat.

Thanks to our superb Strategic Air Force, we are immeasurably stronger than they are today. Weapons on the drawing board and weapons-in-being are two different items. SAC could obliterate four Russias now.

Most important, let's stop the ridiculous notion that we will never use the first blow in the next war. This is suicidal.

FRIDAY, MAY 27, 1960

TODT'S OPINION

## House Probers Needed Badly

By  
George  
Todt

"Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty."—Curran.

Ought we to do away with the House Un-American Activities Committee?

The California Democratic Council says we should. Also most of the radical liberal organizations within our republic. Rep. James R. Roosevelt



Todt

(D-Calif.) has had a bill to this effect before Congress during the past two years.

I do not agree with these people.

Recently I was invited to address the Los Angeles County Republican Assembly on this subject. My theme: these are the most dangerous times ever faced by our republic and we cannot afford the foolish luxury of being without the HUAC.

In diametrical opposition to the CDC, I found not a single member of the Republican Assembly who wanted to abolish HUAC. This is significant, in view of the fact that the committee is chairmaned by one of the nation's most able Democrats, Rep. Francis E. Walter of Pennsylvania. No party politics here.

The truth of the matter is that HUAC is in danger today because of the rise to power of the internationalist World Federalist clique among the Democratic leadership, both on the California and national level. It has always been present, since the end of World War II, but

CDC manifesto issued at Fresno.

These are the people who are in the forefront with their incredible counsel that we disarm unilaterally, if necessary, and dissolve our national sovereignty—all for the sake of "one world."

We are only indulging in the wildest and most incompetent daydreaming if we imagine the Communist international conspiracy will play ball with us in any form of "world government" which would be acceptable to the moral and spiritual ideals of our republic.

On the contrary, such a controversial vehicle would merely be utilized to trap the people of this nation—and our allies in the bargain—into the slave world of Marxist mediocrity.

The reason all subversives fear the HUAC is because it has the capability of attracting attention to their misdeeds against our way of life. They cannot stand the spotlight of public scrutiny. That is why many voices are being raised today—some of them innocent dupes, perhaps—to ask us to get rid of our protectors.

Taking a strong line against subversion before the American Legion convention here in 1956, Vice President Nixon, a former HUAC member, had this to say:

"It is time that we realize that well-intentioned but mistaken men can be as great a threat to a nation's security as Communists or fellow travelers. The best example of this is Czechoslovakia. The leaders of that unhappy country, with the best of intentions, took Communists into their government. The Communists, in turn, took over Czechoslovakia!"

Why make agreements with them in the first place? History over the last 42 years proves conclusively that the amoral men in the Kremlin cheat and break their word at any given moment — whenever it is opportune for them to do so.

Obviously, it is apparent that this is neurotic action when viewed from any angle. But there is also something at least weak-minded about nations that permit such action to recur with alarming frequency — and beg for more!

Dulles observed this truism and treated the Communists accordingly. He told the world that diplomacy was a fine art in which adept nations often marched close to the brink of war to gain their points — and then moved away skillfully before blows were traded.

His utter fearlessness of the Soviets and their complex propaganda lines made him the leader of the West at the diplomatic table. He kept the Reds off balance. And he called the tune.

Gruff, aggressive tactics of this kind are the only ones capable of gaining respect from our wily enemies today, on the world stage. They understand force and power. But they will kick pacifists and appeasers in the teeth. This is the certain way to destruction.

If we are to survive in the modern world jungle, we will give short shrift to such inane counsel in the future. We must demand of our leaders that they be tough in every respect against the Reds — show them forcefully that we will not be pushed around.

## Fernando Valley

### Dulles Had Right Idea About Russ

By GEORGE TODD

"The best doctor is the one you run for and can't find." —Diderot.

The crude and impossible antics of a Khrushchev at the summit can best be explained, it seems to me, by a paradox.

The less we have to do with the art of brinkmanship, as expounded by the late and gifted Secretary of State John Foster Dulles, the closer we come realistically to the brink of war with the Soviet Union. Why is this so?



Dulles was a great man because he was tough minded and practical. He knew how to deal with Ivan. Here was the modern-day equivalent of a Bismarck or a Teddy Roosevelt; iron fist in the traditional velvet glove of diplomacy.

Like it or not, we were able to hold our ground with the Communist warlords while he was alive. That is the test that counts with us. Under the guidance of this tough, old man we held the initiative in world affairs. But do we do so now?

The answer is, unfortunately, negative. The reason is that we bought the "peaceful co-existence" line after Dulles' death. Much of this was at the insistence of some of our allies, notably Great Britain.

Dulles did not like the idea. However, he realized that our allies had a right to their say in matters affecting our mutual security. So he went along—but he did not buy the concept personally and dragged his feet at every opportunity.

"Peaceful co-existence" did not receive a real play until Dulles was in one grave. Then we seemed to have almost within a matter of days it was a real mistake.

If the Soviet leaders were men of their word, if they knew and respected morality, there might be a chance. But such is not the case. They are atheists who deny God, and they deny spirituality and morality out of hand.